

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

DENNIS LOCK,

Case No. 6:15-cv-00536-TC

Plaintiff,

FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

v.

6 UNKNOWN AGENTS, STATE OF
CALIFORNIA, and JUDGE McSHANE,

Defendants.

COFFIN, Magistrate Judge:

Similar to other cases, pro se plaintiff has filed yet another a complaint against six unknown federal agents and Judge Michael McShane, but including the State of California as a defendant this time.

The court previously granted plaintiff's application for IFP status, but declined to order issuance of process due to certain deficiencies in the complaint. The court noted the lack of factual support for the claims, confusing and irrelevant allegations, and lack of specific conduct on the part any defendants. In addition,

the court noted the complaint failed to allege any conduct taken under color of law and possible issues of immunity. Accordingly, the court dismissed the complaint with leave to file an amended pleading curing the deficiencies.

Plaintiff has now filed an "Addendum to Complaint." However, rather than address the deficiencies, plaintiff merely states:

THE ACTION IS SIMPLE THE 16 INSTANCES OF SUSPICION ARE NOT BEING SPECIFICALLY ACTIONED AS STATED IN COMPLAINT AND AT THIS POINT WILL ONLY BE CALLED AS WITNESSES CONCERNING THE 6 UNKNOWN AGENTS.....


THE CHARGE IS SIMPLE ARE 6 UNKNOWN AGENTS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCOMPANYING VIOLATIONS OF PLAINTIFFS RIGHTS BY THEIR 'INVESTIGATION' AND THE TESTIMONY OF SO MANY WILL SATISFY EVEN THE MOST STRICT SENSE OF PROSECUTION.

Addendum to Complaint (#7) at pp. 1-2. Although plaintiff concludes with requests for clarification and specific details if the addendum along with the original complaint do not suffice, the court has already provided a list of deficiencies. Plaintiff has neglected to cure those deficiencies. Accordingly, it is clear that any further attempts at amendment would be futile and, therefore, the complaint should now be dismissed without leave to amend.

This recommendation is not an order that is immediately appealable to the Ninth Circuit Court of appeals. Any notice of appeal pursuant to Rule 4(a)(1), Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, should not be filed until entry of the district court's judgment or appealable order. The parties shall have fourteen (14)

days from the date of service of a copy of this recommendation within which to file specific written objections with the court. Thereafter, the parties shall have fourteen (14) days within which to file a response to the objections. Failure to timely file objections to any factual determination of the Magistrate Judge will be considered as a waiver of a party's right to de novo consideration of the factual issues and will constitute a waiver of a party's right to appellate review of the findings of fact in an order or judgment entered pursuant to this recommendation.

DATED this 22 day of June 2015.



Thomas M. Coffin
United States Magistrate Judge